UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

John Haynes Holmes
Editor in Chief

Louis L. Mann
Curtis W. Reese
Associate Editors

Equality and Progress

By H. R. MUSSEY

Nationalism and Internationalism

By EDWARD HOLTON JAMES

Russia and Liberalism

By ROBERT WHITAKER

Police and Peasantry in India

By REGINALD A. REYNOLDS

VOLUME CVII NUMBER 7

Chicago, April 13, 1931

UNITY

Established 1878

Published Weekly *Subscription $3.00*

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter, October 10, 1930, at the Post office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879"

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor in Chief*
EDITH LLOYD JONES, *Managing Editor*

Associate Editors
LOUIS L. MANN CURTIS W. REESE

Board of Directors
MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, President
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-President
MRS. FRANCIS NEILSON, Treasurer
MRS. ELLA NAGELEY
MRS. EDITH LLOYD JONES
MR. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS
MR. FRANCIS NEILSON
Secretary: MAY JOHNSON

Editorial Board
EDMUND B. CHAFFEE
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
M. C. OTTO
RAYMOND H. PALMER
ALSON H. ROBINSON
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors
LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Editorial Contributors
W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
CHARLES E. BEALS
PERCY M. DAWSON
FREDERICK STARR
JABEZ T. SUNDERLAND
JAMES H. WEST

Foreign Representatives
AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
WALTER WALSH
CANADA—NORMAN STEWART DOWD
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
ITALY—DOROTHY WALTON
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL— Page

Notes 99

Equality and Progress—H. R. MUSSEY 101

Jottings—J. H. H. 103

ARTICLES—

A Free American Looks at India—II. Nationalism and Internationalism—EDWARD HOLTON JAMES 103

Russia and Liberalism—ROBERT WHITAKER 104

Police and Peasantry in India—REGINALD A. REYNOLDS 105

Thoughts of Tolstoy—Part XXII 108

POETRY—

These Gifts I Ask—MARGUERITE EMILIO 99

THE STUDY TABLE—

The Jew Maligned—RABBI LOUIS I. NEWMAN 109

A Social Survey—JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE 110

"Ninety Years at the Isle of Shoals"—E. H. WILSON 110

CORRESPONDENCE—

War Resisters International—H. RUNHAM BROWN 111

THE FIELD—

The Seminar in Mexico (Concluded)—HUBERT C. HERRING 98

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

The Seminar in Mexico

(Continued from last issue)

Sixth Session, Mexico City, July 4-24, 1931

Field Trips. These are planned for the purpose of introducing the members of the Seminar to typical villages, rural and urban schools, agricultural and industrial experiments and scenes of special archeological and ethnological interest.

There will be the following trips: two days in Puebla, Cholula and neighboring villages, with visits to schools, churches, etc.; a two-day trip to Cuernavaca and Taxco; a one-day trip to the Convent of Acolman, the Pyramids of San Juan Teotihuacan and the Temple of Quetzalcoatl; a trip on the first Sunday to the Shrine of Our Lady of Guadalupe and to the floating gardens of Xochimilco; a one-day trip to Cuautla, Oaxtepec and neighboring villages.

Optional Trips to Other Sections of Mexico

The program closes in Mexico City on Friday, July 24. For the two weeks of July 24-August 7, special trips for small groups will be arranged to Oaxaca and Mitla and the surrounding country; to Guadalajara; to Patzcuaro and Uruapan in the state of Michoacan, and to other points if sufficient numbers request it. A competent leader will be in charge of each group, and local programs will be arranged with the cooperation of the educational leaders and others. Full information will be furnished upon request.

Nicaragua

If ten or more members of the Seminar so elect, there will be a special trip to Nicaragua during the month of August under the leadership of Mr. Charles Thomson of Costa Rica and New York. A program will be arranged in various Nicaraguan centers, and an opportunity given to meet with the leaders of the various groups in that country. Full information will be sent upon request.

Former Seminars

The Seminars of the Committee which have been held in Latin America during the past five years have been attended by over four hundred men and women, among them Judge Florence E. Allen of the Supreme Court of Ohio, President Ada Comstock of Radcliffe College, President J. Edgar Park of Wheaton College; such editors and writers as Paul U. Kellogg, Mary Austin, Herbert Croly, Isaac Landman, Samuel Guy Inman, Paul Hutchinson, Benjamin Stolberg, Dan Brummitt, Dorothy Detzer, and Waldo Frank; such professors as Herbert A. Miller, Edward A. Ross, Chester Lloyd Jones, J. Fred Rippy, Charles G. Fenwick, Alva W. Taylor, William Franklin Sands, and Daniel J. Fleming; such clergymen as the Right Rev. Edwin V. O'Hara, Father

(Continued on page 111)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

VOLUME CVII MONDAY, APRIL 13, 1931 NUMBER 7

THESE GIFTS I ASK

[A Hymn]

Help me to hold my peace, O God,
When evil tongues would smirch my name;
Grant me a shield of self-control
To meet the darts of undue blame.

When jubilant with words of praise
And even balance grant to me;
A sense of humor may I have
To save me from complacency.

Give me the insight that can pierce
Beyond the thoughtless word or deed;
May true serenity of soul
And inner peace be mine at need.

A thirst for knowledge grant to me,
Not only of the ancient lore,
But let me have a questing mind
Which seeks the truth that lies before.

These gifts I ask, but this I know,
Thou canst not give them unto me,
Unless I first have opened wide
A free and willing heart to thee.

MARGUERITE EMILIO

The triumph of Gandhi is now complete. The whole-hearted support of the Karachi Conference, coupled with the capitulation of Subhas Chandra Bose, leader of the violent revolutionary party, has put the Mahatma officially at the forefront of the life of India as the undisputed leader of all her people. This action of the Conference also confirms and re-establishes Gandhi's agreement with the Viceroy for a "truce" pending further negotiations for the accomplishment of *Swaraj*. The terms of the resolutions adopted by the Conference endorse the provisional settlement between the Mahatma and Lord Irwin, while making it "clear that the Congress goal of independent home rule remains intact." They instruct the delegation at the second Round Table Conference to

> . . . work for this goal, and in particular so as to give the national control over the army, foreign relations and finance, and to have scrutiny by an impartial tribunal of the financial transactions of the British government in India, and to examine and assess obligations to be undertaken by India or Great Britain and the right of either party to end the partnership at will.

Thus is silenced the complaint that Gandhi had sacrificed any point of his cause in his truce with the Viceroy, and affirmed again the judgment voiced in these columns that by this act of consummate statesmanship he has only consolidated his forces for the next and final step in the long campaign for national independence. India is already now dealing with Britain as an equal. She is laying down her own terms, backing them with her own power, and directing them to her own ends. What Gandhi has done in the space of a year constitutes one of the miracles of history. And all achieved by that steadfast reliance upon suffering and sacrifice which we in the West are taught is of no avail in the practical affairs of men! To what confusion are we put, to what endeavors are we prompted and inspired, by this humble leader of a people's cause in ways of peace and brotherhood!

The miracle of Gandhi's spirit as applied to the affairs of India is only an extension on a vast scale of the spirit which for forty years has been working such miracles in personal relations. Wonderfully beautiful is the story printed in the daily press of Gandhi's conquest of the "reds," the Indian Communists, who sought to stir up revolt against him at Karachi. The execution of Baghat Singh and his two comrades, an act of supreme stupidity by the British *Raj*, had given these advocates of violence their chance. They had mobbed Gandhi on his arrival at Karachi, deriding him, denouncing him, and insulting him with opprobrious epithets. One of the more excitable of the group had even assaulted the Mahatma and tried to strike him with a club. At last a deputation of the hostile "reds" demanded to see Gandhi, that they might ask of him why he had not saved Singh and his comrades from death. The Mahatma of course received these men, and spoke to them as only he can speak.

> I shall not complain if you beat me. I have no bodyguard, (he said). God alone keeps vigil over me. Some think me crazy, some a fool because of my love for my enemies, but it is the very foundation of my whole life's work and creed.
>
> I have nothing left to sacrifice. I have no worldly possessions. I am a beggar. But the day that India abandons the sacred principle of non-violence I shall let my fragile body perish. If you say that I am doing harm to India you have a right to do so, but it is my duty to turn you to the path of affection and truth. I have no weapon against you except

love. Let none take upon himself the duty of protecting me. God alone can do that.

Before Gandhi had finished speaking, so the newspaper despatch records, his antagonists were sobbing. "All left in a humble, penitent mood." Thus does love conquer all! Mahatma Gandhi is not a Christian in any formal or technical sense of the word. But what Christian of us all has ever so perfectly exemplified the injunction of the Master:

> Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you.

The real significance of the Austo-German customs union should not be obscured. Austrian and German statesmen are clever in describing it as a part of the movement toward economic cooperation and unity in Europe in accordance with the proposals of M. Briand, but French statesmen are quite right in ignoring this and pointing to something else. What we have in this agreement is, first a long step toward the political union of Germany and Austria. This union has been inevitable, of course, ever since the close of the Great War, but France has refused to believe it and obstinately resisted it. Now it has come, or at least has been begun, as a part of the necessary trend of European affairs. Secondly, this agreement is the beginning of the end of all the treaties made in 1919 in regard to Austria, and a stunning blow at the substance of the Versailles Treaty itself. We regard this new arrangement as fundamentally Germany's announcement to the world that she is now entering upon a definite policy of repudiating the treaty terms of 1919. From both these points of view we welcome this Austro-German customs union. In spite of the furious opposition raging against it, it means the ultimate stabilization of Europe. So long as the settlements following the Great War are allowed to stand, so long Europe is held on the brink of chaos. Nothing can serve to save the situation but a scrapping of all that was done at Versailles and the Trianon. The Allies, of course, should have done this long ago. Now the central countries, long betrayed, have begun to take matters into their own hands. Let the good work go on, until the terms of settlement forced upon the conquered in 1919 at the point of the sword, and therefore of no validity, are done away with altogether, and peace at last restored to a distracted continent.

Does witchcraft still survive in the world? In a special despatch from Paris to the New York *Times* we read:

> The desecration of the Cathedral of Notre Dame by the suicide today of a Mexican woman made it necessary to close the church's doors for the first time in many years while the ceremony of reconsecration was carried out. It required three hours to perform the elaborate ritual which began promptly at sunset.

We do not know the nature of the ritual which was required to purify and reconsecrate the church after the pitiful self-destroying act of a frightened or insane woman, nor do we want to know. But we are convinced, from the very nature of the act, that a ceremoney which took three hours for its performance was nothing less than an elaborate piece of hocus-pocus which had no real or even imaginable relationship to anything even remotely resembling the facts of human life. What we have here is a beautiful illustration of the type of religious thought and practice against which humanism is revolting today as a protest in the name of decency and truth. What happened in Notre Dame, according to the Catholic interpretation, was some kind of a profanation, which was an offense to God. Before the deity would again be willing to receive worship or answer prayers offered in this edifice, it must be delivered of its pollution and God thus fittingly appeased. And to this end there is a ceremony—three hours long! In essence, of course, this is magic, or witchcraft, which has nothing whatsoever to do with religion. What the humanist sees in the whole affair is a human tragedy, the mad act of a distraught or irresponsible woman, calling in her case for compassion, and in the larger sense for such works of individual healing and social reform as shall deliver the souls of men from the distresses that now drive them to desperation. If priests were half as busy saving the world as they are in serving churches, there might be fewer suicides.

The Birth Control movement has just enjoyed a great gain, and suffered a great loss. The gain is to be found in the amazing endorsement of Birth Control by the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America. By the impressive vote of three to one in its Committee on Marriage and the Home, the Council approved "the careful and restrained" practice of the method by married people. This victory is doubly impressive as following upon the remarkable statement on the subject by the Lambeth Conference in England a year ago. "The Birth Control battle is about over," says the *New Republic;* "the churches are merely recognizing a revolution which has already taken place." At the very hour of this triumph, however, there came direful loss to the cause in the sudden and untimely death of Dr. James F. Cooper, medical director of the American Birth Control League. With this eminent and consecrated physician, the movement had become a passion and a life-mission. More than any other leader, even Mrs. Sanger herself, he broke down the opposition of the medical profession, and thus swung science to the support of the cause. Dr. Cooper started his career as an obstetrician in the Boston University Medical School, where he learned much about the problem of children and the poor. He later spent five years in China, where he came face to face with the full horror of over-population. Now a thoroughly convinced advocate of Birth Control, he

returned to this country to serve the movement as its ablest missionary. He traveled ceaselessly in every state of the Union, speaking to medical societies, schools, hospital staffs, whoever would listen. His word was gentle, conciliatory, persuasive, but backed with facts fired by passionate conviction which carried everything before it. We have seldom seen a more perfectly fused combination of scientific knowledge and prophetic zeal. We are glad that Dr. Cooper lived to see the triumph of his cause, and to receive the applause of all who now knew the high merit and devotion of his service.

The death of Arnold Bennett is the most serious loss to English fiction since the death of Thomas Hardy. It is natural to associate these two great novelists, for both created, or took over, portions of England for the scenes of their tales, and made these districts distinctively their own. What Hardy did with Wessex, Bennett did with the Five Towns. These midland manufacturing communities, with their worker and small merchant inhabitants, became under the magic of Arnold Bennett's pen as real a country as the heaths and farms of rural England with their peasant people whom Hardy so deeply understood. Of all Bennett's voluminous, far too voluminous writings, the Five Towns novels are the works which will be remembered; and of these, two stories, "The Old Wives' Tale" and "Clayhanger," are destined to immortality. To these two we would add a more recent volume, "Riceyman Steps," as a masterpiece of the first order. It was in the infinitely minute study of the uneventful lives of humble people, that Bennett was at his best. He had a sympathy with these people, and an insight into the essential romance of their days, which reminded inevitably of Charles Dickens. There was little of the sweep and power of Dickens in his stories, and none of the extravagance, but the same sort of genius was at work. Bennett, in addition to being an author, was a triumphant man of the world. He played the piano, painted pictures, tirelessly attended concerts and art-exhibits and "first nights" at the theatre, owned a private yacht, traveled widely, haunted luxurious hotels and expensive playgrounds. It was the necessity of sustaining this type of life which kept his pen busy turning out the greatest number of "pot boilers" ever produced in cold blood by a writer of the first rank. Much of this journalistic stuff was clever, all of it was readable; it disappeared almost as fast as it was manufactured. But the artist in Bennett never died, or was ever spoiled. He could do great work to the end, and in this work his fame is secure.

Equality and Progress

I wish that every discouraged democrat in the United States could real R. H. Tawney's new book, "Equality." Certainly democrats everywhere need all the encouragement they can get, what with the present creaking and cracking of our economic and political system, with the communists attacking us on the left and the fascists on the right, and with the thoughtful young people, if they interest themselves at all in such matters, apparently turning with increasing impatience from the slow and bungling processes of discussion and political democracy to the swifter methods of dictatorship with their seductive promise of quick results. Some of us still believe that we were on the right track before the war turned us to violence and sudden change. To those who believe both that social change is imperative and that it is important to make that change by orderly democratic processes, Mr. Tawney has something important to say.

His primary concern here, as in all his works, is a spiritual and intellectual one. Quite unmoved by the current pseudo-scientific justification of inequality, he comes out boldly for the largest possible equalization of material possessions, not in any vain attempt to make equal men who by nature and capacity are unequal, but in a clear-eyed attempt to give those inequalities scope and room so that each human being may arrive at the full flowering of his powers. As things are now, that possibility is in no small measure dependent on the accident of wealth. In Mr. Tawney's own words:

> The reason for equalizing, as means and opportunity allow, the externals of life is not that the scaffolding is more important than the shrine, or that economic interests, for all their clamor and insistence, possess the unique and portentous significance which the fashionable philosophy of the age is accustomed to ascribe to them. It is not, as austere critics assert, to pamper the gross bodily appetites of an envious multitude, but to free the spirit of all. In the currency of the soul, as in that of states, spurious coin drives out good. . . . The chief enemy of the life of the spirit . . . is, as everyone knows, the idolatry of wealth, with its worship of pecuniary success, and its reverence for the arts, however trivial or unamiable in themselves, by which success is achieved, and its strong sense of the sanctity of possessions and weak sense of the dignity of human beings, and its consequent emphasis, not on the common interests which unite men, but on the accidents of property, and circumstance, and economic condition, which separate and divide them. . . . It is not favorable to simplicity of life, for it makes much of display; or to sincerity of mind, for it burns incense to shams; or to a just and sensitive taste, for its criteria are those of quantity and mass; or to harmonious relations between human beings, for it labors hard, and with success, to multiply discords. But, with all its crudities and extravagances, the creed rests on a reality. It draws its strength from the truth that, as the world is today, wealth opens the gates of opportunity, and poverty, save for fortunate exceptions, still commonly closes them. So it is not sufficient to exercise the demon with pious conjurations. It is necessary to destroy the hard pediment of fact, on which his power reposes.

If ever there was a society which needed to lose its undue respect for its rich men, it is the United

States of the year 1931. Our whole development has been such as to give us a superstitious reverence for the men having those characteristics (too often wolf-like) that enable them to accumulate large fortunes. Despite their economic value, such as it is, those characteristics are by no means the highest or the most valuable socially, and an essential condition of our getting forward from where we now are is for people to lose their admiration for those men and begin to admire men more worth while. But as long as individual wealth is the condition of full opportunity, so long are people unavoidably going to admire the man who has the capacity to get rich. If men could have health and education and leisure and recreation and culture without wealth, then wealth would assume its rightful minor place in society, and reasonable men, and even ordinary men, might well come to regard it with comparative indifference. But when for the ordinary man all these highly valuable things do depend on wealth, how can he do other than value wealth supremely and respect highly the man who knows how to acquire it? A society that values the wrong things will perish; if we are to save our civilization by replacing present false values with true ones, we must accomplish it by a bold equalitarian program, an unashamed attack on great individual wealth as bad for him that has it, and bad for him that has not.

The method of such attack is not a crude dividing up. Nobody advocates that, though much misplaced ingenuity has been devoted to showing that it would not do any good. Even the communists do not follow that method, though they come closer to it than would probably be possible in a non-communistic state. But even in a society like our own the essential method of equalization lies open to us, provided we really believe in equality and want to bring it about. That method consists in the universal provision of the requirements of good living by social action, the means being supplied by heavy progressive taxation. This is a method with which we are already familiar to some extent, in the provision of public schools, for example, and parks and playgrounds and museums. It is a method that is all the time being extended. The extent of practical communism that prevails in almost every large American city today is striking enough. But we have made little more than a beginning in what we could and should do, and must do if we are to escape disaster or revolution. We are all too apologetic for such programs. We listen with respect to all the old worn-out defenses of inequality, from the alarms of Malthus to the pleas of President Hoover crying out for the maintenance of American initiative. Instead of regarding them seriously, we ought to pitch them on the dump heap and go courageously ahead, remembering that every step in making collective provision for common needs has been greeted with similar predictions of disaster that never came to pass. To just the extent that we do make such provision, to that extent do we deprive wealth of its really serious signficance in human life.

It is often urged that the heavy taxes required for the carrying out of such a program mean the ruin of industry, and consequently the drying up of the stream of wealth out of which the means for the program must be provided. It is a strange notion that a community might ruin itself by using its resources to help make its citizens healthy and well-trained and cultured, and friendly to one another. Suffice it to say in reply that no evidence has been adduced to show that the social services with which modern states have increasingly provided themselves have proved other than good investments, nor is there any reason for believing that the investment of capital resources in the improvement of the quality of life for the human agents of production, instead of in the increase of the material means, in many industries already largely in excess of our capacity to utilize them regularly, will do other than cheapen the real cost of producing material goods. This, too, is an argument that we need not allow to prevent us from moving rapidly in the direction of equality. We know the method, we possess the machinery, and we have plenty of successful examples of the use of the technique. It remains simply to see whether we have the courage of our convictions in moving rapidly toward that material equality which is the essential condition of opportunity for the mass of men, and consequently of their forming a true judgment of the relative unimportance of wealth.

As a necessary supplement to this method, Mr. Tawney urges a scheme of economic control and direction based on the consent of the workers, the consumers and the state, not simply that of the owner. In view of recent revelations in coal and cotton, he points out, "the pretense that the capitalist is the heaven-inspired guardian of economic efficiency is a bluff too unplausible even to be entertaining, a body blow at another of the superstitions that still keep us in bondage to things as they are." If wealth, then, were no longer a prerequisite to health and education and culture, and if it conveyed no title to economic control and no monopoly of economic initiative—under such circumstances wealth would possess no great importance, and we should have attained to that degree of equality which really matters. Such equality we can have if we really want it; for as Mr. Tawney points out, we are not the puppets of a blind economic determinism. Class struggle indeed is a fact, and it is possible to proceed in accordance with the formula of Karl Marx if we so elect. But we can also choose the other course, for history is determined by the wishes and choices of men, and not by certain ineluctable economic necessities of their being. For us today, then, the question is, do we want equality, and if we

do, are we ready to pay the price of getting it? If we do want it, and if we are willing to pay the price, then we may proceed undiscouraged on the road that leads to its attainment, hopeful that each step taken will serve to show more clearly both the desirability and the practicability of the goal we seek. But it may well be that in this present time we must make haste if men are not to turn aside from the true path and take the short-cuts that lead to destruction.

H. R. Mussey.

Jottings

Dwight Morrow functions as effectively outside the Senate as he functions ineffectively inside the Senate. His destiny is obviously that of a diplomat or executive, and not that of a legislator. We wonder if this means anything to the Republican Party!

The progress of the third-party movement reminds us of the progress of the Red Queen in "Alice Through the Looking Glass." It is running as fast as it knows how, and staying all the time exactly where it is.

Look at Chicago, says Democratic Chairman Shouse, as the scandals in Democratic New York get worse and worse. Yes, look at Chicago *and* at New York together! The two old parties are functioning in the same way under the same conditions. It's the case of "pot and kettle" to perfection.

Speaking of Mr. Shouse—"what's in a name?" We never see this name but what we find ourselves thinking—What an ideal name for a representative of the "wet" Democrats of the East! And the same applies to Mr. Raskob, whose name always suggests "rascal" to our ears.

Twenty-five per cent of the children of Los Angeles have never seen a cow. Is not the time at hand for the establishment of a new type of zoo in our great cities? Instead of lions, tigers, elephants, etc., why not exhibit cows, horses, pigs, sheep, and rabbits?

President Hoover's reception in Porto Rico was wonderful. But the Democrats are still sleeping nights. There are no electoral votes down there!

J. H. H.

A Free American Looks at India

II—Nationalism and Internationalism

There is the question of nationalism or internationalism. The Indians are pounding at the door of nationalism, while such minds in the west as possess significance are focusing their thought on creating a league of peoples, an "international," a world-state, a United States of the world, a cosmopolis, a citizenship of the world. All this, vague as it may be, is an unerring sign that the Christian mentality is doing its work. The peoples of the west, sick of flags and wars, are turning back to that internationalism marked out for them nineteen centuries ago, by that early church for which even the radicals among them still continue to have respect. That church had said: "Spread the gospel. Go and tell all peoples. The kingdom of heaven is at hand." Telling all peoples means internationalism. Well, tell them what?

India, hammering on nationalism, trying to hoist a new flag among the eighty or ninety already decorating the map of the world, presents the appearance of trying to "catch up" with the west. She talks about "independence day" and framing a constitution very much as Thomas Jefferson or John Hancock might have discussed those subjects a hundred and fifty years ago. America has inspired India. Let America go on inspiring India, and let India help America so that the Statue of Liberty in New York harbor does not fall into the sea.

Must India leap the hurdle of nationalism before she can "catch up" with the cosmopolitanism of the West? Can we see Gandhi as the president of an Indian republic, surrounded by prancing diplomats in full-dress, with armies and navies maneuvering in response to his pressing an electric button in the presidential palace in Delhi? No. Gandhi controls the world best from a prison. He has fulfiled that line of Emerson: "Chambers of the great are jails." He makes England's statesmen look contemptible.

Or, leaving nationalism to one side, there is another possible vista for India. She will throw this struggle for nationalism suddenly into the arena of internationalism. She will throw her car into higher gear. She will rally those firm, determined souls of all countries, those Jeffersons, Rousseaus, Mazzinis of the present, who don't need to catch up with anybody, and she will challenge them to found with her the league of free peoples, the world state, labor's world-state, the social, peaceful, human international of the future. The battle for freedom, the emancipation of labor, is not limited to India. It is a world-wide battle. Today there exists in India the kernel for a world-state. It is called the All-India Congress. It can become the World-Congress, the corner stone of the league of peoples. That is one thing that can happen in India.*

Edward Holton James.

*But these things are not settled on paper. The people, so helpless today, tomorrow or next day will have found their power.

Russia and Liberalism

The article which appeared in UNITY for March 16, 1931, entitled "Reflections of a Liberal on Russia," and signed, "Alan Dare," a curiously inept *nom de plume* for a concealed authorship, however much justification there may be for the reticence of the writer, seemed to me so startlingly revealing of the bankruptcy of liberalism that I cannot resist the opportunity which it affords for a frank discussion of this reverse aspect of the matter which the article exhibits.

For it is not Russia that is stripped naked here; it is liberalism. A woman reader of the article, intelligent and independent in a rare degree, remarked to me after she had read it word for word that she thought it the most viciously insidious attack upon Russia which she had ever read, and she has read many. She is an American, and a Christian, but she has taken pains to inform herself concerning world situations as a whole. The article pained me. But it was for the writer and his class; for the "liberalism" which the article voices I had my concern. There are times when I feel a measure of hope that American liberalism may not prove as utterly wanting in the understanding of our own social evolutionary process as did the liberalism of Russia. Such articles as this which UNITY published affect me with a profound discouragement, not for Russia, abundantly able to take care of herself, but for our own land, which is plunging toward a like crisis and a like failure of liberalism to measure up to the challenge of the testing hour.

No reader of UNITY will question, I think, the failure of the Russian Church. I remember that back in 1907, ten years before the Russian revolution, I preached one evening for Dr. Batten, then minister of the First Baptist Church of Lincoln, Nebraska. As I came down out of his pulpit he took my hand warmly, and apropos of some reference which I had made to Russia he remarked, "Brother Whitaker, if you and I lived in Russia we would have to repudiate Christianity to save our religion." Batten was a man of extraordinary social interest, and all the more a Christian for it, and his remark was a prophetic anticipation of what has fallen upon Russian Christianity by reason of its unspeakable failure to be worthy of the name. Today, however limited in use the particular words may be, the conviction carries not only in Russia, but by reason of Russia's insistence upon it, and a like basis of fact in more or less degree, that "religion is the opium of the people."

What American liberals fail to see is that liberalism is also, by the same judgment, a social soporific, more dangerous in a way than religion itself, as Russia intimates by a more rigorous suppression of liberalism than of orthodox religion. There are not lacking in the United States scores and hundreds of American churchmen who will confess openly the utter failure of religion to meet the demands of decency and righteousness and social awareness in Russia, and who admit without resentment that severe as is the judgment meted out to organized Christianity there the judgment was self-invited and well deserved. But I have yet to find an American liberal of standing who is equally cognizant with these clergymen of the social failure of Russian liberalism, or who has a realistic reaction to the fear and distrust toward liberalism as a social reactionary force which the present Soviet administration entertains. Christians by the thousands are confessedly regretful and penitent for the Christian failure. Liberals are complacently critical and more socially impervious than even their fathers were.

For be it admitted candidly and gratefully that there were liberals in Russia under the Czar who were dissatisfied in no small degree with social conditions there, and who spoke out at much expense to themselves for a better order. At this point the liberal record was far better than that of the churches. Liberals may be granted some of the credit for the breakdown of Czardom, though in the main Russian liberalism was as powerless there as American liberalism is here to stay the progress of a recalcitrant exploitation system toward catastrophe. The economic status of the liberal is always and everywhere that of a dependent upon the dominant economic class, and therefore he is never able to make effective warfare for really consequential change. He will seek to amend, but he rarely risks his social status for anything like a fundamental change which will abolish all class distinctions. He fears the hell of falling himself into the working class, and he covets too much the heaven of the recognition and emoluments which go with the favor of the owning class, and therefore he is always trying to compromise as between the two. Religion may bless the established order, and insist that "the powers which be are ordained of God." Liberalism does worse; for it seems to speak for change, and the rights of man, but will always proceed toward it with such caution to conserve the niceties of the present situation that no real revolution can be achieved. Gandhi, before he is done, will find Indian liberalism a harder thing to meet than British conservatism, for the reason that it will balk at the inevitable operation, which is necessary to do away with the cancer of special privilege, rather than submit to the mussing up of the room.

The evidence is the failure of liberalism everywhere, including our own country. I can remember more than fifty years of American liberalism, as I recall distinctly shouting for Horace Greeley when I was yet a child. Greeley was in many respects a great and good man. He had worthy successors. It seems incredible now that Grover Cleveland was ever the prophet of American liberalism, as it does that Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson and William Jennings Bryan, and if I may say so Robert M. Lafollette were taken so seriously. Good men they were, in my opinion, as that term commonly goes. Great men they were, as compared with the pettifogging timeservers around them. The more credit they are allowed the more glaring and pitiful is the exhibit of their failure. The American plutocracy has not stayed a step of its onward march to the domination of the American people for all of them. Nor is there the slightest indication today of any power in American liberalism to slow up the march of American imperialism. Liberalism in America, and everywhere else, for reasons already intimated in the definition of its dependent economic status, is powerless to even so much as advocate those decisive measures by which alone the course of special privilege can be stayed. It is more dangerous than reactionary religion, for it always seems to promise something, and always betrays the cause by

insisting that the citadel shall remain in the hands of the enemy.

The fact is liberals, as a whole, are the partially privileged. And the partially privileged can never abolish privilege. They are too covetous of more, and too timid about having less. There are exceptions of course. But exceptions only prove the rule. There is an old bit of love-verse that is pertinent here:

> He either fears his fate too much,
> Or his deserts are small,
> Who fears to put it to the touch,
> To gain or lose it all.

Liberals are always for "safe" measures, which are half-way measures, and effectively no measures at all. A glaring exhibit of it was recently seen in the Imperial Valley. The American Civil Liberties Union sought to get liberal support to compel some decent treatment of the organized workers. Not a minister, or other member of "nice" society dared to lift a hand. Too much to lose, of actual or prospective good. The Civil Liberties Union is itself a "liberal" organization, but the liberals in every community, as a class, fight shy of it, because it is risking something for the workers. The thing is logical, inevitable. Whoever leans upon the liberals will find himself sooner or later impaled upon a broken reed. To let them in on the settlement of any vital issue is to confuse the issue, and to suffer from abortive compromise. The Soviet authorities know what they are about. They are building a new order, not putting patches of liberal sticking-plaster upon an old and collapsing civilization. Our whole peace movement is the justification of the Soviet suspicion and criticism of liberalism. It is a mess of miserable compromise which makes us think we are getting somewhere, and therefore leads us all the more certainly into the hell of another world war. Liberalism can neither say yes nor no. It is always trying to say both at the same time.

No wonder liberals do not understand Russia. But Russia does understand them. And so will we when we get down to the real job of building a society wherein exploitation is done away.

ROBERT WHITAKER.

Police and Peasantry in India*

The Judge's wife and the wife of the Settlement Commissioner were talking at afternoon tea. Their conversation drifted across to my corner, where I had been listening to the Settlement Commissioner patronizing a *zamindar*. The ladies were obviously discussing a recent hunt.

"Did you hear," said the first lady, "that one of their beaters died of sunstroke and two were killed by a tiger? But none of the party were hurt—weren't they lucky!

To which the other lady made answer:

"Yes, but won't it make it rather hard to get beaters there next time?"

The incident was not easily to be forgotten, and I have often told the story. This time, however, I do not repeat it so much for its own sake as for its value as a peg on which to hang a footnote. The footnote in question is the comment of an Indian friend of mine who said:

"They will get beaters all right: *The police will see to that.*"

As it stands, that looks an extravagant statement; one may well ask, "How will the police get beaters?" Before answering that question I have one more story to tell.

A lady I know well was at a dinner where drink was liberally supplied and the talk was somewhat unguarded. Conversation turned on motoring, and the obstruction sometimes caused by bullock carts. These clumsy vehicles are by no means easy to drag off the road (as is often necessary) when the motorists' infuriated horn is heard.

But the Colonel had a tip for the other gentlemen. Recently, he said, a man had failed to move out of his way in time, and he decided "to give the man a lesson." By his own account the "lesson" consisted in getting down from his car, setting free the bullocks with a couple of kicks that sent them into the jungle, and giving the driver a thrashing.

The story is too bad to be called typical, but it may well be called an extreme case of the sort of thing that is continually going on in India. Yet only once in a hundred times will you hear of the culprit being brought to justice.

Now, to take the second story first, the possibility and indeed the recurrence of such incidents certainly indicates one thing: that the peasants, who suffer such indignities and injuries in silence, can have no faith either in the police, to whom such matters should be reported, or in the system of justice which should give them redress. That distinctly suggests a bad experience of them and their methods. My friend, in his comment on the first story, suggested intimidation on the part of the police, which would certainly explain a lack of faith in them. But as it stands all this is mere speculation.

My object in citing these two stories, more or less at random, is merely to show that there is a case to be investigated as regards police powers and their abuse. I make no pretense of being an authority on the Indian Criminal Procedure Code, but there are two sections (109 and 110) which attracted my attention a little while ago because of what seemed to me to be their direct bearing on the question of this alleged intimidation. I propose merely to give such relevant facts as I discovered in a Government publication on these two sections, and leave the reader to draw his own conclusions.

Sections 109 and 110 of the C. P. C. are, technically speaking, concerned with the prevention, and not the punishment, of crime, and they begin with the very plausible assumption that a bad character should be kept under supervision. Theoretically a man cannot be "convicted" or "punished" under either of these sections. He is just kept out of mischief. The United Provinces Government handbook** on "The Practical Application of the Bad Livelihood Sections" states clearly that "sections 109 and 110 of the Code are entirely preventive measures."

To take first section 110, as by far the more interesting of the two, it is designed to keep in check the

*The author of this article is an English Quaker, friend of Gandhi, who as messenger carried Gandhi's famous letter to the Viceroy, Lord Irwin.

**Published by the Superintendent, Government Press U. P. for the use of officers and magistrates.

"Badmash"—the bad character, that is to say. No specific charge need be proved against the individual. The necessary evidence has been summed up in the handbook quoted above as A, Reputation, and B, Disposition.

The following "widely accepted ruling" is given in this Government handbook as a definition of "Reputation."

Reputation is founded on the general opinion of the neighborhood in which the bad character lives. It is not necessary that the evidence should show that such general opinion is based on the personal knowledge of the man by his neighbors generally or that such general opinion has been publicly expressed by his neighbors. If a witness is asked what the man's character is and he were to say that in the general opinion of the man's neighbors the man is an habitual thief, the statement is evidence of general repute (Dunia Singh V. the King Emperor 5 0.c.203).

And the handbook adds,

It is not necessary that the witness should give instances of the person's bad character to justify this opinion or that he should specify the sources of his information so long as he says that this is the general opinion expressed by people about the accused.

A later quotation from the same authority gives further interesting information regarding "Evidence of Reputation":

*"Notwithstanding a ruling of the Bombay High Court to the contrary,** rumor cannot be held to be an evidence of repute." The cat is already out of the bag. We have here a law which can be pleasantly adapted to suit the discretion (or indiscretion) of those who administer it. According to taste you may accept the opinion in the U. P. Government Handbook or the more liberal provisions offered by the Bombay High Court.

Evidence under the second heading of "Disposition" turns upon what are called "specific instances." It is considered a "specific instance" of a man's character that he should have been *suspected* by the police in their investigation of some criminal case. In the nature of things one may assume that the suspicion could not be proved, or the accused would be standing his trial on a different charge. The author of the Government Handbook doubts whether it is generally advisable to prosecute a person only once suspected, but adds: "Generally, however, a second suspicion on good grounds should be enough to satisfy the police officer of the guilt of a bad character." The "bad character" of the accused, being, incidentally, the very point which is to be proved!

Another "specific instance" of Disposition is "association with other bad characters." On this subject the Handbook says:

This association can be proved by witnesses who have seen the accused in association (*it may be in perfectly innocent acts*)* with others who are known to be bad characters.

It really is a pity that the Pharisees and Scribes had no Section 110, for I am quite sure that eating with publicans and sinners would come "within the meaning of the act." And what a splendid measure for dealing with an Elizabeth Fry or a General Booth!

But this is not all: "Assumed association can be proved by simultaneous absences, especially valuable if they can be shown to refer to occasions when offences have occurred." Note, however, that the latter condition is not essential. The law evidently has no intention of allowing even for coincidences! The argument now runs "You left the town last week on the same day as A and both returned yesterday. A is a bad character so you must be another!" Doubtless the usual case is not quite so palpably foolish as this. But this is the backbone of the "argument," and if only one possible case in a thousand is taken up, the *selection is in the hands of the police.*

One amusing "specific instance" given of evil disposition is "sleeping by day when others are working." I fear there are a good many of us who would get run in on this count! I sincerely hope the police keep a close eye on British officers. But to put it mildly, the police are allowed to choose their ground.

As to the actual conduct of these cases, the Government Handbook itself makes some significant admissions, and one illuminating extract may well be quoted in full:

Anything to the discredit of the accused, whether relevant or not, *often whether true or not,* is put forward as evidence against him. No attempt is made to see that the evidence is in accord with the particular bad character ascribed to the accused in the charge. Reputation so-called is frequently mere hearsay or rumor, or less; frequently it is confused with evidence of disposition. *Ipse dixits of police officers are accepted as evidence* of reputation and of specific instances. No one connected with these cases can say that it is an exaggeration of what actually occurs, and it is indeed a matter for surprise that *in spite of these defects the large majority of these cases end in conviction.* (The italics throughout are mine).

Whatever individual cases may be cited to the contrary, one could hardly wish for clearer proof, especially from such a source, of the accepted maxim—more true in India than elsewhere—that it is the magistrate's recognized business to back up the police. But the Author of the handbook realizes that the backing has become too obvious, and in his next paragraph appeals to the police to pull their weight:

Will not the anticipated divorce of executive and judicial functions be the death-knell to success in preventive action if improvement is not achieved? *Do not magistrates frequently, with a realization of their own responsibility, rescue cases from hopeless failure by acting practically the role of prosecuting counsel in their own courts?* Do they *not also frequently convict on bad evidence and incoherent data, which would not for a moment withstand the limelight of appeal or revision? Salvation lying so often in the absence of appeal.*

I have italicized the greater part of this paragraph, but I wish rather that I could have written it in red letters. Here is the plainest insinuation in a Government publication that magistrates frequently help the police out of an awkward corner by convicting on bad evidence, and that the whole business is only possible because the wretched prisoner is either too poor or too ignorant—or perhaps too much intimidated—to appeal! However, as the handbook points out in the next paragraph "it must be allowed that on paper results are good." Or in other words, there is a thriving trade in these cases in spite of the shaky foundations of the firm!

The refinements of legal procedure in this country are aptly illustrated by a reference in the handbook to a standing order in one district "directing that all persons acquitted in dacoity cases" (i. e. robbery with violence) "should be rearrested under this Section." Comment here is hardly necessary. The police are not to be balked of their prey, and a second string is provided for their bow.

It should in fairness be mentioned that the law allows the accused to produce witnesses to his good character and attempt to refute the charges brought against him. These witnesses, however, must possess certain qualifications, and the list given in the handbook is significantly headed by "Social Standing." As

*My italics.

there is no intermediate class between the zaminders and the peasants, this is liable to throw the unhappy tenant on the mercy of his landlord, whose conduct is not always so exemplary that he can afford to quarrel with the police!

Section 109 is less vague in its provisions, and even resembles in some respects the English Vagrancy Acts (as the Author of the handbook is at great pains to point out). It is designed to deal with suspicious characters, persons "without ostensible means of subsistence" and persons concealing themselves "with a view to commit a cognizable offence." I will content myself with two extracts from my authority to indicate the uses and abuses of this Section.

In the first the author is speaking of common "misunderstandings" on the part of the police, and writes":

"It is to be feared that frequently the police embellish their story of arrest." When so much hangs upon the veracity of police witnesses this is scarcely a reassuring statement to read. Yet in a later paragraph we have the following statement:

> We have seen that for the proper conduct of a section 110 case, considerable thought and care are necessary; but in cases under this section *little more than formal evidence of the circumstances of arrest is sufficient* to make out a case for binding over the person sent up. *Indeed, there is no reason why in the majority of cases the police themselves should not provide the evidence required.*

The reader will notice that the handbook speaks here of "a case for binding over the person sent up." The implications of this guileless phrase must now be examined.

My authority reiterates the purely "preventive" nature of these sections, yet on the very first page we read that the object is to "bind him (the prisoner) over to behave himself, or (*as more often happens*) in default of the necessary security, to send him to jail." The portion that I have italicized should be read with due regard to the extreme poverty of the Indian Peasant and the necessity, once more for "Social Status" and "pecuniary fitness" among the qualifications of an adequate surety.

The "preventive" measure is then further detailed as follows:

> If the accused fails to find sureties or to execute his bond, he can be committed to jail and serve out his term there, *undergoing simple or rigorous imprisonment.*

This particular Statement, it should be noted, refers solely to Section 110. Under Section 109 the prisoner can only be sentenced to simple imprisonment.

It will be strange news, however, to those who have studied the art of preventing crime to learn that this object is to be achieved by arresting "suspects" and imprisoning them in the common jails. The argument is peculiarly farcical in the case of "rigorous imprisonment," which is the punishment meted out to the worst criminals, under conditions that make our "hard labor" look mild indeed! Persons convicted under Section 110 may be imprisoned for a maximum of three years, the longest period in the case of Section 109 being twelve months.

Finally the author of the handbook, patently conscious of the defects in the system, laments that the jail must replace the workhouse "until the march of civilization creates these more humane agencies for dealing with the nuisance of Vagrants." And one wonders how long the Government will wait for "the march of civilization"!

Further quotations are surely unnecessary in order to establish the extraordinary nature of these laws, together with the dangerous powers they give to the police and the undoubted abuse of those powers. In England a jealous watch is kept on police authority, but in India, where the temptation of the police is enhanced by the poverty and helplessness of the peasants, there is little or no check on them. On the contrary, the man who dares, in spite of the odds against him, to take action in the courts against the police is almost sure, if he loses his case, to be promptly tried for perjury.

A final reflection occurs to me, in the nature of a *reductio ad absurdum* proof of the preposterous nature of these oppressive laws. In no country in the world have the police such a bad name as they have in India, so much so that almost everyone one meets has at least one personal experience of their corruption. In the nature of the case they are in fact, so far as the Indian members of the Service are concerned, composed of the worst types of men who are content to be the tools of an alien government in whatever oppressive measures it may choose to execute against their fellow-countrymen. The man who joins the police may at any moment have to do the will of some Sir Michael O'Dwyer. Such being their reputation, how would most of them fare if they had to stand their trial under Section 110? You may say that the reputation of the police is undeserved, but Section 110 makes no provision for undeserved reputation: And I fear that if this ridiculous measure were fairly administered, almost the entire Police Force would soon be in jail. But there is no attempt made at the systematic administration of these measures. The chief use of a bad law is that it can be held over the heads of individuals as a means of coercion. Injustice cannot be impartially administered, for that is not its purpose.

It is better to prove one point up to the hilt than to hint at half a dozen; and in concentrating on these particular sections I have had to ignore a great deal of possible material. In no sense is this an attempt at an exhaustive enquiry into Police powers and their abuse; but I think it establishes the existence of an insidious evil beyond any shadow of doubt, and more than explains the type of story of which I have given examples—for the police in India seem just as anxious to be on the right side of the Ruling Class as they are indifferent to the claims of plain justice in dealing with the peasants. The penal code from which they draw their authority has, indeed, "the Constitutional" support of the Legislative assembly; and if a body elected on a property qualification and representing an extremely small percentage of the population* (with a large proportion of Government nominated members) can be considered qualified to speak for India, then it may be assumed to have received popular support. But personally I have little doubt as to what the opinion of the silent masses would be if they could express themselves freely, either on the Law or on those who administer and uphold it.

REGINALD A. REYNOLDS.

London, England.

*The enfranchised citizens constitute just over 3% of the population of British India. Out of 144 members of the Assembly, 40 are government officials or nominees, the Europeans also being represented out of all proportion to their numbers.

Thoughts of Tolstoy

[Selections from Tolstoy's "Readings for Every Day" here published for the first time in English]

LXXIV

1.

Man is given power only over himself. He can only organize his own life as he sees well and fit. But almost all men are concerned with trying to organize the lives of others, and because of this concern for organizing men's lives, they themselves submit to the organization that is prepared for them by other men.

2.

To think that, by arranging your life differently, you can make it better, is the same as to think what little children do: that if they sit on a stick and take both ends and pull them up, they can raise themselves and begin to fly.

3.

People are so used to violence that they think they can live in harmony only because there are courts, police, armies.

Not only is this untrue, but on the contrary all these courts, police and armies interfere more than anything else with the friendly and harmonious life of men. All these institutions have put men in such a position that it is impossible for them to live without violence. And yet people bring up these very institutions as a proof of the statement that men cannot live without governmental violence.

4.

The superstition of organized violence has become rooted in our society to such an extent, one constantly hears people say that they want to serve men, to serve the people, to make people happy by their labor: some by training, some by educating, some by enlightening, and some, as is most frequently the case, by ruling them. All these people are doing what nobody asked them to. Every rational man who wants happiness for himself and for the people, can, on the contrary, ask only one thing of them: to take care of themselves, of their own souls, and leave the people, whom they serve with such zeal, in peace.

5.

Men are rational beings: hence they live under the guidance of reason, and should inevitably substitute free consent for violence. But every act of violence puts off this time.

6.

To what purpose is the reason of men, if it is possible to act upon them only by violence?

LXXV

1.

So long as violence is recognized as legitimate, men's life can be neither good nor rational.

2.

"They tell me: 'Give so much money to so-and-so who is called the government.' This so-and-so orders me to go as a soldier and to promise to murder whomsoever he orders. I ask 'Who is this so-and-so?' They tell me 'The government.' 'Who is the government?' 'Men.' 'What sort of men are these, some special sort?' 'No, the same as everyone.' 'Then why should I do what they order me to? Even if all that they ordered were good,—but they order me to do downright evil. I don't want this. Leave me in peace.'" This is what all men ought to say, if only they were not so stupefied by the superstition of government.

3.

It stands to reason that men should take care of cows, horses, sheep. Men know what cattle need, and how best to herd them. Horses, cows, sheep cannot herd themselves, because by their very nature they are all alike. And in the same way people are all alike. Why, then may some men command others, and force them to live as they see fit? All men are equally rational beings, and only that which is superior to them may rule over them. The one thing superior to them is the spirit that dwells in all of them: what we call conscience. Hence people may obey only their own conscience, and not men who call themselves kings, congresses, chambers, senates, courts.

4.

Power over other men is nothing but the recognized right not only to deliver others up to torture and slaughter, but to make them torture themselves. And chiefs can only make men torture and slaughter each other at will, through deceptions, falsehood, perfidy, and above all through cruelty. Rulers have always acted in this way, and they cannot act otherwise.

5.

You need only reflect upon the substance of the use of governmental power to understand that the men who rule the nations must be cruel and immoral, and must inevitably stand lower than the average moral level of their time and society. No moral man, even no man who is not utterly immoral, can sit upon a throne, can be a minister, a legislator, an arbiter of the fate of whole nations. A moral, virtuous statesman is just such an inner contradiction as a chaste prostitute, a temperate drunkard or a gentle bandit.

LXXVI

1.

When thou prayest, thou shalt not be as the hypocrites are: for they love to pray standing in the synagogues and in the corners of the streets, that they may be seen of men. Verily I say unto you, they have their reward.

But thou, when thou prayest, enter into thy closet, and when thou hast shut thy door, pray to thy Father which is in secret; and thy Father which seeth in secret shall reward thee openly. But when ye pray, use not vain repetitions, as the heathen do: for they think that they shall be heard for their much speaking. Be not ye therefore like unto them: for your Father knoweth what things ye have need of, before ye ask Him. (Matthew VI, 5-8).

But be not ye called masters . . . for one is your Master, even Christ; and all ye are brethren. And call no man your father upon the earth: for one is your Father, which is in heaven. (Matthew XXIII, 8-9).

Christ said this in plain words. But what are those men doing who consider him their God, and his teaching their law? They celebrate mass, vespers and every sort of church-service. Moreover, as if in defiance and mockery of the words of Christ, who says plainly that no men should call themselves masters and fathers, a whole class of people who consider themselves the chief connoisseurs of the law, call themselves both masters and fathers.

2.

It needs only understanding of the teaching of Christ in its true sense to make clear the deception in which we were brought up, and in which our brothers are now being brought up.

3.

Prayer consists in calling up in myself the divine essence, after having dismissed all things worldly, all things that might distract my emotions. (The Mohammedans do well when, on going into the mosque, or beginning to pray, they close their eyes and ears with their fingers.) It is best of all, as Christ teaches, to enter alone into my chamber and shut myself up; that is, to pray in complete solitude, whether it be in a chamber, in the woods or fields. Prayer consists in dismissing all the outward and the worldly, in calling up in myself the divine part of my soul and passing over into it; in entering through it into communication with Him of whom it is a particle; in recognizing myself as the servant of God; in verifying my soul, my deeds and my desires according to the demands, not of the outer conditions of the world, but of this divine part of my soul.

And such prayer is not an idle emotion and excitement such as is produced by public prayers with their singing, pictures, illuminations and sermons; but it is aid, strengthening, elevation of the soul. Such prayer is a confession, a verification of past action and a guide for future action.

4.

Great harm arises from lying to others, but it is most harmful of all to lie to yourself. Such lying is especially harmful, because when you lie to others, people find you out, but when you lie to yourself, there is no one to find you out. And therefore, beware of lying to yourself, especially when faith is in question.

5.

Do not think that the Christianity of the church is incomplete, biased formal Christianity, but still Christianity. Do not think so. Not only is the Christianity of the church no Christianity, but it is the most wicked foe of true Christianity. In relation to true Christianity, this Christianity of the church is like a criminal caught in the very act. For it there are only two ways of escape: either to destroy itself or to go on committing ever more and more new crimes. And however hopeless its position, it still continues its horrible, criminal activity.

6.

A thought expressed in the Gospel, the Bible, the Koran, or the Upanishad does not become true because it is expressed in books that are considered sacred. To count true everything that is said in those books recognized as sacred, is idolatry of books, which is more harmful than any other idolatry.

7.

It is a very common mistake to think that there are universally recognized teachings that can be accepted on faith. Man is obliged to verify by his reason every teaching that is given out as the truth.

(To be Continued)

The Study Table

The Jew Maligned

Ben Hecht has written an atrocious defamation of the Jew in his new novel.* I hesitate to mention it either in print or in public utterance, lest it help call attention to the book. It is necessary, however, for spokesmen of the Jewish people to repudiate this vicious malignment. If we allow it to pass in silence, both Jews and non-Jews may be inclined to think it gives an accurate picture of the emotional life of the typical Jew. Why Ben Hecht has called his story of the pathological Jo Bosshere, "A Jew in Love" passes all understanding, unless he believed that this title would attract a large Jewish reading public upon which publishers and booksellers have come to depend. Even if he had called it "Bosshere in Love" it would have been repulsive; it becomes all the more hateful because he gives the impression that sensitive, intelligent Jews act like the pathological creature he has portrayed. The Jewish people which has produced the "Song of Songs," a pure and beautiful collection of love lyrics is to be judged not by the debased works of a Ben Hecht, but the high standards of family devotion in the Jewish household, by the close and tender bond between the Jewish husband and wife, and by their passionate and enduring love for their children. The late President Charles W. Eliot of Harvard University paid a rightful tribute to the role which Jewish marital and family affection has played in the survival of the Jewish race. It ill becomes Ben Hecht to cheapen the coinage of Jewish repute by making the chief character of his novel an unhealthy, horrid and thoroughly obnoxious individual.

It is not necessary for anyone to purchase the volume, take it from a public or private library, or otherwise concern himself with it. It has no redeeming features whatsoever. It should never have been written. If it had been devised and distributed by non-Jews, we would have declared it to be a fiendish effort to inculcate anti-Semitism by new and vicious methods. It is certain to rebound upon the Jewish position in this country as time goes on. When the Literary Humanists, among them Paul Elmer More, wish to condemn the "modern temperament" in literature, they speak of the "Jewish mentality" with its "pathological corruptionist" tendencies. Ben Hecht's novel plays into their hands with a directness that makes one tremble for the exultation with which the literary adversaries of the Jew will welcome it. Jo Bosshere is no more representative of the Jew than Esterhazy was of France, or Benedict Arnold of the United States. Evidently the book market is at low ebb, and a few reckless authors and publishers are seeking to captivate public attention, regardless of the ultimate harm they may bring to pass.

I am the last one to advocate a superimposed literary censorship, but Ben Hecht's novel gives the rigorists ample ammunition for their attack. Whatever censorship should have been followed was by Ben Hecht himself. Under the pretense of artistic freedom, Hecht has done American Jewry genuine harm. We can only hope that his novel will receive the indifferent attention it deserves. We trust it will be a commercial failure so that Hecht will not be tempted to imitate this volume again. If he has talent, let him turn it to clean, healthy and sound themes, not sicklied o'er with the morbid cast of pathology.

(Rabbi) Louis I. Newman.

*"A Jew In Love," by Ben Hecht.

The Indian Revolution

The author of this pamphlet* is an English

*"India, Gandhi and World Peace," published by Friends of India, 46 Lancaster Gate, London. Price, two pence.

Quaker. He is known to the readers of UNITY by his contributions to the columns of this paper (see notably his article on "India as an International Problem" in the issue for March 9th last). He is known to India as the friend and comrade of Gandhi. He is known to the world as the young man who was the Mahatma's chosen messenger to bear his final letter to the Viceroy before the march to Dandi.

In this pamphlet of 26 pages Mr. Reynolds has written the best account of the Indian situation that we have seen in so small a compass. He reveals the forces underlying and the factors involved in a revolution which in its ultimate significance is destined to make even the Russian Revolution seem unimportant. He presents Gandhi's "greatest miracle," the arousing of the peasantry of his country who are the center and soul of what is a genuinely proletarian uprising. He relates the nationalism of the Mahatma to the international ideal, of which it is "a condition of its fulfilment," and to Christianity, of which it is an applied expression. He reveals the mind of Gandhi, and the popular mind which this one individual mind has created in India, and fits these against the arrogant imperialism which they confront together. He contrasts the two philosophies of brute force and of spiritual love, and shows how in these philosophies lie the origin of the two world powers which are now at war in India. He states the ultimate responsibility of Britain for what has happened, and prophecies the ultimate failure of Britain if she continues present policies. Her way, which is "the way of continued repression," is for that reason "the way of death."

The pamphlet is beautifully written—with fine conviction and fervor, and yet with restraint. It is based on ample information, the literary sources of which are setdown in a bibliography. Striking quotations from the words of Gandhi and Jawaharlal Nehru are set down in the text. To one who would know the deeper spirit as well as the higher vision of the Indian movement, this booklet is indispensable.

J. H. H.

A Social Survey

Jerome Davis has turned out a wonderful piece of work in his "Contemporary Social Movements."* This impression will be shared even by those who received volumes previously issued under his editorship with qualified enthusiasm. He certainly is gaining skill as compiler and editor. In this volume he magnifies his office as editor, properly subordinating his function as compiler to the aim of producing an effective monograph.

The volume is monumental in its proportions. There are more than 900 pages, for the most part all close print. The bibliographies are exhaustive if not in places exhausting. The quotations from authoritative sources are choicely selected. There is fine balance in using the material.

At the same time Dr. Davis's own predilections are not completely submerged. He is a liberal, at points a radical, and his sympathies with progressive movements are manifest in his treatment. At the same time he is now sufficiently the balanced scholar to utilize effectively the statements of outspoken opponents of the causes which his friends well know appeal strongly to his progressive spirit.

The broad sweep of his treatment is indicated by the book topics. He divides the volume into ten books, the ninth and tenth of which are respectively conclusion and appendix. The other eight are (1) Introductory sociological considerations; (2) Utopias; (3) Socialism; (4) Communism; (5) Fascism; (6) The Cooperative Movement; (7) The British Labor Movement; and (8) The Peace Movement. The reader will at once observe that the eighth is not in full logical sequence with the others. Dr. Davis is himself conscious of this, but most readers will agree with him that he properly includes in his volume interesting and stirring recent developments in the concerted peace movement throughout the world.

His treatment of the other seven is consistent throughout. Probably both partisans and opponents in each case will honor him for the success in which he has epitomized and presented the material. Any one who wishes to inform himself about these great social movements can come out of even a hurried review of this volume with a consciousness of intelligence which must be refreshing. For the student of any one or of all these movements the volume is a reference book indispensable.

The material is organized so as to be capable of use in the class-room, from which source indeed the volume emanated, since Dr. Davis is a member of the Faculty at the Divinity School at Yale. The presentation is, however, sufficiently popular to commend the book to general readers. Many a thoughtful citizen who has no occasion to pose as a specialist in the social field will wish to have this volume at his elbow or within easy reach on his book shelves. To have ready access to this mine of information will give a citizen poise and assurance in the discharge of his daily responsibilities which ought to prove heartening to all who will avail of Dr. Davis's good help.

JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE.

*"Contemporary Social Movements," by Jerome Davis. Published by the Century Company.

"Ninety Years at the Isle of Shoals"

Here is a simple tale** of a long life lived on an Island ten miles out to sea from Portsmouth, New Hampshire. It is clearly written and delightful in its naivete. It could serve any writer of ocean-side tales as a source book. It has sidelights on the nineteenth century literati including the writer's sister, Celia Thaxter, which biographers of the period will find interesting. Sea lovers who are landlocked far inland will find in it the tang and substance of salt water lore. Of course the book will mean most to ex-Shoalers who have known Uncle Oscar Laighton as a venerable saint beloved by all who attend the summer conferences of the Unitarians at Star Island. They are glad that Uncle Oscar has found smoother sailing since the Unitarians purchased the island and will place this book besides the volume of his poems to enrich their memory of a man who has established himself in their affections.

E. H. WILSON.

**"Ninety Years at the Isle of Shoals," by Oscar Laighton. Boston, The Beacon Press, 1930.

Correspondence

War Resisters' International

Editor of UNITY:

I know that you have been long associated with the Peace Movement in the States, so I suppose you know something of the War Resisters' International.

For the last nine years we have been exploring the world in order to find those young men who are resisting military training and every form of war service. We have been extremely successful, having our contacts now in fifty-six different countries and organized groups in twenty-one. But our success reveals the tremendous difficulties and hardships under which many of these men are struggling. In no less than ten countries they are now suffering imprisonment, sometimes for long terms and sometimes even with the prospect of indefinite repetition of those terms of imprisonment for their steadfast refusal to go into the army. We seek to make their heroic stand effective by giving publicity to it and by giving them a sense of solidarity. We are able to pour in messages to them and to their relatives from every part of the world. Men who have taken this stand believing they were quite alone, have had the whole world opened up to them through the International, and it has often seemed to them miraculous that they should find hearts beating for them practically everywhere. We have made representation to the various Governments on their behalf, not of course using the name of the International, but we have had the support of some most eminent people, such as Professor Albert Einstein, Mr. H. G. Wells, Monsieur Romain Rolland and Monsieur Victor Marguéritte. Many members of the British Parliament and our Groups have co-operated with us in pouring in appeals with such influential representation that it is having quite an effect on some Governments at least. Just recently we have secured the release of one man in Poland. This man, Andrej Poliszczuk, is a devout Christian—a Tolstoyan. He took his stand three years ago believing he was quite alone. His friends had given up all hope for his being released from prison for many years, in fact he himself had expected to die there, when we discovered him. We have effected not only his release, but his dismissal from the army altogether. I send you herewith an abridged copy of the last letter I received from him.

We cannot carry on our work much longer unless we can obtain some greater financial support. Our yearly budget only just turns $5,000. My home is turned into an office and there is no secretary's salary. Almost the whole of our expenditure is for our publications and for postage. These costs are very heavy, because we have to print in many languages and send to all parts of the world. Up to the present nearly all our money has been raised in England. We can expect little from the European Continent. Our German section, although capably run, is worked on an extraordinarily small income; the secretary lives in one room and uses that room for an office; he receives so small a salary that his wife goes out to work. This is the sort of thing which is happening in most of our Groups on that Continent.

We have had two International Conferences, which have brought together representatives from all parts of the world. We ought to have held a Conference last summer, but we could not find the money to do so. We have fixed the Conference for Lyon, France, and the date for 1st-4th, August. But the Conference is still in jeopardy, because we must raise $1,500 in addition to our ordinary funds to carry through this Conference successfully, otherwise some half of our delegates will be shut out for the mere lack of the traveling expenses.

I should be happy to send you more information if you wish it, and I trust to have your co-operation in this work.

H. RUNHAM BROWN
Hon. Secretary.

11 Abbey Road, Enfield,
Middlesex, England.

Appended

Letter from Andrej Poliszczuk, recently released from prison in Poland after three years. He was sentenced to one and then to five years' imprisonment for refusing military service, with the probability of repeated imprisonment until over military age.

20th September, 1931.

Dear Brother, Runham Brown,

Hearty thanks for your letter. Thanks to your energetic activities I have nearly become world-famous and even now I am receiving letters of congratulation on my release from single personalities as well as from editors of newspapers. I have read with great satisfaction and thankful feeling your article which appeared in newspapers and periodicals on the occasion of my release. Not quite do I deserve the gratitude expressed in these letters towards my firmness and will-power; for I think it to be my duty to do what I find reasonable; and I, a son of humanity, express to you in the name of all thinking and reasonable men, our greatest thankfulness for your indefatigable work for the progress of our glorious idea of brotherhood, love and freedom of the people of the whole world.

Please convey my gratitude to all friends who took and are still taking part in the struggle against violence and militarism. When I entered the fight against universal militarism and evil, I did not know that somewhere else there existed men who were acting likewise. I knew one thing—one has to be sincere, one has to act according to one's conscience and common-sense. I knew I always had to do the right thing; and even if there should not be other men to stand with me, I must alone try to win, by word and example, humanity for the best idea in the world; to show them how to overcome the world of violence and militarism and evil. But what great fortune, after long and difficult years of lonely struggle, there arises out of the whole world a whole army of fine, like-minded friends, to come and help me, to free me, an ill man and save my life. But this does not mean that I am now going to remain idle and do nothing more. No, my soul would never and will never, be content with the existing injustice. God has given me life. But neither God, nor conscience, nor common-sense have told me to be a slave of militarism, and I shall never be one, because I cannot stick a bayonet into another human being like myself, with the same nerves, feeling the same pain, and who does not want to die any more than I do.

I thank you wholeheartedly for your interest in our friend, Alexander Mozolewski. I hear that you have already sent some money to help him in spite of the International being in such a critical financial position. I confess, with shame, that up to the present I have not in any way been able to send a small sum for the support of the International even though I have made use of your help. I am saving every penny I have for Alexander Mozolewski's case, in which I want to take active part.

Will you please write me in Esperanto.

With all best wishes,

Yours with love,

ANDREJ

The Field

(*Continued from page* 98)

Frederic Siedenburg, Father Joseph F. Thorning, Rabbi Ephraim Frisch, Rev. Cameron P. Hall. Dr. Henry M. Edmonds; lawyers such as Walter Frank, Milford Stern, Allen S. Olmstead, Frank H. McCulloch, Catharine Waugh McCulloch, Herbert J. Friedman and Jackson H. Ralston; social workers as Alice Gannet, Edna Strohm and Kathleen Jennison Lowrie; representatives of the National Y. W. C. A. and Y. M. C. A.; representative physicians, librarians, bankers, business men and artists.

Membership

The membership of the Sixth Seminar in Mexico will be limited to two hundred. Membership is limited to those whose business, educational, organizational or other connections make it possible for them to reach public groups in the United States. The Committee invites a representative group to membership. We welcome men and women who reach university and college audiences, women's clubs, civic and educational organizations, and who, through speaking and writing, have a share in moulding public opinion. A few university upper classmen will be accepted, when recommended by faculty members. Those whose chief interest is that of the tourist are asked not to apply. The members of the Seminar will have ample opportunity to enjoy the pic-

turesque side of Mexico, but the Seminar is primarily planned for those who wish to make a serious study of the country and its culture.

The Seminar, it should be noted, is committed to no political, economic, or creedal point of view. Its purpose is to secure facts and insight. It is a fixed policy of the Committee that no resolution shall be adopted, and no findings reported. The Committee serves no propagandist's cause.

Staff

The staff of the Seminar will include thirty men and women, including the Director and assistants, the leaders of the round tables, interpreters and advisors, the research associate of the Committee who will be prepared to furnish reference material, and those in charge of business arrangements.

The sessions of the Seminar will probably be held, as in the past, in various halls generously furnished by the National University of Mexico.

The Charm of Mexico

Mexico City is one of the charming and interesting cities of the world. Its churches and archeological monuments, its markets and street fairs, its fiestas and pageantry, its boulevards and palaces and parks offer a variety of interest which is unexcelled by any city of Europe. It is a composite picture in which you can trace the hand of Toltec chieftains, Aztec kings, Spanish conquistadores, Indian artists, French engineers, German architects and North American business men.

The climate of Mexico City is delightful the year around and especially in summer. There is no hot weather. You will have no use for light summer clothing. Take the type of clothes which you use in New York, Chicago or San Francisco during spring and fall, and overcoats of substantial weight for the evenings. The altitude of the city is 7,400 feet. There are light rains practically every afternoon.

The charm of Mexico lies in its inexhaustible variety of scene. The physical setting of Mexico City, with its cactus punctuated plains, hills, mountains, all dominated by the white peaks of Popocatepetl and Ixtaccihuatl, lays its spell upon you. Two hours away is Cuernavaca, three thousand feet lower than the capital, with streets as charming as when Cortez chose the town as the site of his palace, and with gardens in which color runs riot. Four hours away is Taxco, a village built against a mountainside, with the loveliness of the hilltop villages of Italy and France, unspoiled by tourists.

As a place for a vacation Mexico is unexcelled. There is opportunity for golf, tennis, riding, and mountain climbing. The schedule is arranged so that members of the Seminar can golf, ride, etc., before the morning sessions at 10:30.

Expense

The Committee on Cultural Relations with Latin America is maintained mainly by the contributors of its supporters. Each member of the Seminar in Mexico pays an amount which covers his expenses and, in addition, a share of the expense incident to the Seminar.

The business secretary of the Committee, together with its representatives in Mexico, makes all arrangements for transportation, hotels, local meeting places, field trips, etc. An inclusive rate is furnished each member of the Seminar. This rate covers round trip railroad or steamship fare, pullman, hotel room, field trips, the printed report of the Seminar, and a share of the expense of the program. The experience of the Committee indicates that this arrangement saves time and money for the members and ensures greater comfort. A special train leaving St. Louis the evening of July 1 will carry the majority of the members. Members from the Southeast and the Pacific Coast will join this train en route. Others will go by water from New York. Members from the Pacific Coast may choose between several routes into Mexico. The inclusive rate from New York by rail is $459.30, by water $464.50; from Chicago $394.30; from New Orleans $381.40; from San Antonio $346.60; from Minneapolis $415.30; from Los Angeles (via West Coast route) $408.30. Rates from other points will be furnished upon request. These rates have been closely figured, and are made possible by the fact that the Committee is a non-profit organization, partially supported by contributions. The rates quoted may be reduced somewhat by the use of upper berths or according to the type of hotel room desired, etc. A bulletin containing the necessary information regarding travel arrangements will be furnished to those interested.

Applications for Membership

Applications for membership in the Sixth Seminar in Mexico should be addressed to the Director. When applying, state your profession or business, your academic record, and your connections with educational, civic and other public organizations. A deposit of $50.00, payable at the time of registration, reserves a place in the Seminar. This deposit will be returned in full if, for any reason, it is necessary for a registrant to withdraw prior to June 1. In cases of withdrawals after June 1, the Committee reserves the right to retain one-half of the deposit if necessary in order to cover expenses already incurred and not recoverable. Address all correspondence to

Hubert C. Herring,
Executive Director.
112 East 19th Street, New York City.

EINSTEIN SAYS

The way to abolish war is to declare in peace time your refusal to give service in war time.

If you agree with him, enroll with

WAR RESISTERS LEAGUE
171 West 12th St., New York City

Phone Oakland 0489 **JANITORS' SUPPLIES**

Everything in HARDWARE
AT
JOHNSON'S
4236 Cottage Grove Ave.

The
Oakland :: Press
GOOD PRINTING
Invitations, Announcements, Programs, Letter Circulars, Business and Personal Stationery, etc.
3913 COTTAGE GROVE AVE.
PHONE - ATLANTIC 1876

The Twelve Greatest Women

A jury of five men have presumed to select "the twelve greatest women in America." Says a critic: "All lovely ladies, and no doubt kind to flowers."

Why do these male judges omit a woman who is so great in the cause of social justice that she is hailed as "World Mother" in Europe as well as in America?

Felix Salten, author of "Bambi," wrote recently in the "Neue Freie Presse" of Vienna: "In Altadena, California, lives a woman, Mrs. Kate Crane-Gartz. . . . . One feels a joyful confidence because there is in America such a nature as this, a WORLD MOTHER."

Rob Wagner, in his lively journal, "Script", says: "There she is, looking out over a suffering world with the eyes of a mother—beautiful eyes, in a beautiful, smiling face. . . . Using the economic status great wealth gives her, she goes right after the leaders of her opposition."

Read the indictment of poverty, unemployment, and war in

STILL MORE LETTERS

the sixth volume of Kate Crane-Gartz, and guess why five men on a jury prefer ladies who are "kind to flowers."

Price, $1 cloth; 50 cents paper

Mary Craig Sinclair
Pasadena, California